

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

BEATRICE HUDSON,	)	
	)	8:05cv331
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
vs.	)	
	)	
CITY OF OMAHA, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

In filing no. 4, the court's Memorandum and Order of August 8, 2005, I denied the Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis ("IFP") filed by the plaintiff, Beatrice Hudson, and I directed the plaintiff to pay the court's \$250 filing fee and amend her complaint by August 26, 2005. The plaintiff originally sued the City of Omaha and the Omaha public library, alleging racial discrimination, after the plaintiff engaged in an altercation at the library on July 11, 2005, and a police officer issued a citation.

As I noted in filing no. 4, the plaintiff has filed an unusually large number of lawsuits in this court within approximately one year (currently sixteen cases), each alleging violations of her civil rights and each accompanied by a request to proceed IFP. At least eight of those cases have involved claims against the City of Omaha and its agencies such as the police department and the public library. The plaintiff has prevailed on none of those cases, and many have been dismissed as frivolous. Many of the cases involved various hostile encounters between the plaintiff and other persons, after which the plaintiff received a ticket or other restraint.

As I reminded the plaintiff in filing no. 4, the fact that many of the people with whom she engages in disputes are white and the plaintiff is African-American does not give rise

to a presumption of racial discrimination. In addition, conclusory allegations of racism, conspiracy, discrimination and retaliation do not transform a state-court tort action, at most, into a federal constitutional claim.

The plaintiff has filed an Amended Complaint (filing no. 5) and a Supplement (filing no. 7). However, those documents do not cure the deficiencies of the original complaint pointed out in filing no. 4. Instead, the plaintiff has merely added 27 more defendants. In addition, the plaintiff failed to pay the court's filing fee as ordered in filing no. 4. She was warned that, in the absence of the filing fee and a properly amended complaint by August 26, 2005, this case could be dismissed without further notice.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED:

1. That filing no. 6, the plaintiff's renewed Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, is denied;
2. That this action and the plaintiff's complaint are dismissed, without prejudice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii); and
3. That a separate judgment will be entered accordingly.

September 21, 2005.

BY THE COURT:

*/s Richard G. Kopf*  
United States District Judge